THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

A. RANDY WATTS

OCTOBER 17, 2008



DOCKET NO. 2008-196-E

Combined Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for a Base Load Review Order for the Construction and Operation of a Nuclear Facility in Jenkinsville, South Carolina

Page 1 of 5

1		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
2		A. RANDY WATTS
3		FOR
4		THE OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF
5		DOCKET NO. 2008-196-E
6		IN RE: COMBINED APPLICATION OF SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS
7		COMPANY ("SCE&G" or the "Company") FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
8		ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND
9		NECESSITY FOR A BASE LOAD REVIEW ORDER FOR THE
10		CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A NUCLEAR FACILITY AT
11		JENKINSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA
12		
13	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.
14	A.	My name is Randy Watts. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite 900,
15		Columbia, South Carolina 29201. I am employed by the State of South Carolina as
16		Program Manager of the Electric Department for the Office of Regulatory Staff ("ORS").
17	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.
18	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from the
19		University of South Carolina in Columbia in 1976. I was employed at that time by the
20		Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") as a Utilities Engineer in
21		the Electric Department and was promoted to Chief of the Electric Department in August
22		1981. Subsequent to internal Commission restructuring, my position was redesignated
23		Chief of Electric in October 1999. I remained in that role until transferring to my current

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

A.

1 position with ORS in January 2005. I have testified on numerous occasions before the 2 Commission in conjunction with fuel clause, complaint, territorial assignment, Siting Act 3 and general rate case proceedings.

4 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

The purpose of my testimony is to provide the results of ORS Electric Department's review of SCE&G's Combined Application for a Certificate for construction and operation of the Company's proposed two (2) new nuclear units at the site of the existing VC Summer Nuclear Station located near Jenkinsville, South Carolina. The Company's Application was filed pursuant to the Base Load Review Act ("the Act"), S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-33-210 et seq. (Supp. 2007). Our review addressed the issues of rate design, jurisdictional and class allocation factors, and rate revenue verification.

13 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR ANALYSIS OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED 14 RATE DESIGN.

15 A. Section 58-33-270 (D) of the Act in general requires that..."In establishing 16 revised rates, all factors, allocations, and rate designs shall be as determined in the utility's last rate order...". I have reviewed the Company's proposed tariffs and rates in this filing and found the rate designs are consistent with those approved in the Company's last rate case Order No. 2007-855 issued on December 14, 2007 under Docket No. 2007-229-E.

21 Q. DID ORS VERIFY THAT THE PROPOSED REVISED RATES GENERATED 22 THE ADDITIONAL REVENUE AMOUNT THAT THE COMPANY

23 **REQUESTED IN THE APPLICATION?**

1	A.	Yes. The Company's target revenue increase was \$8,986,000 as shown on Exhibit
2		M, Chart A of the Application and exhibits of Company witness Best. Due to the general
3		complexity of rate designs of the various tariffs, their interdependent relationships, and
4		the vast amount of billing determinants, it is difficult to set rates to generate a precise
5		dollar amount. In these instances it is common practice to adjust rates while maintaining
6		the appropriate rate design, and generate revenues as close to the desired level without
7		exceeding the targeted amount. The Company has done this in this case with the resulting
8		revenue increase of \$8,981,199 or approximately \$5,000 less than the targeted amount.
9	Q.	WHAT METHODOLOGY DOES THE BASE LOAD REVIEW ACT REQUIRE
10		BE USED TO SPREAD THE ADDITIONAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT?
11	A.	Section 58-33-270 (D) of the Act requires "that the additional revenue
12		requirement to be collected through revised rates shall be allocated among customer
13		classes based on the utility's South Carolina firm peak demand data from the prior year."
14	Q.	DID THE COMPANY USE THIS METODOLOGY IN DETERMINING THE
15		REVISED RATES IN THIS PROCEEDING?
16	A.	Yes. The Company used the summer 2007 coincident class peaks to determine the
17		appropriate percentage upon which to spread the requested additional revenue
18		requirement to the Residential, Small General, Medium General, and Large General
19		Service class categories. The actual retail peak load class and revenue spread data are
20		shown on Exhibit K of Company witness Jackson as well as in the Application.
21	Q.	WHAT OTHER FACTORS WERE PERTINENT IN ORS' REVIEW OF THE
22		COMPANY'S APPLICATION?

1	A.	The standard procedure for determining the proper spread would be to initially
2		allocate system costs and revenues to the various jurisdictions across the Company's
3		entire body of customers. These could include not only retail and wholesale, but also
4		multi-state jurisdictions as well. In the case of SCE&G there are only two jurisdictions
5		that make up the Company's South Carolina system, which are retail and wholesale. In
6		the course of ORS' review and examination of SCE&G's filing, we discovered the
7		Company failed to allocate any of the proposed plant costs or revenue requirement to its
8		wholesale jurisdiction. Based on the Company's summer 2007 coincident peak, the
9		resulting allocations to retail and wholesale are 94.33% and 5.67%, respectively.
10		Therefore, before the revenue requirement can be spread to the retail class categories the
11		total requirement must first be separated between the wholesale and retail jurisdictions.
12		These allocation factors were provided to ORS's Audit Department.
13	Q.	WHAT EFFECT DOES THE COMPANY'S FAILURE TO ALLOCATE ANY OF
14		THE ADDITIONAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT TO THE WHOLESALE
15		JURISDICTION HAVE ON THE PROPOSED REVISED RETAIL RATES?
16	A.	The result is an over statement of the revenue requirement to the South Carolina
17		retail class and subsequent revised rates that are excessive.
18	Q.	WHAT IS THE CORRECT AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL REVENUE
19		REQUIREMENT FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA RETAIL CLASS?
20	A.	It is first necessary to establish the total Company revenue requirement for the
21		period ending June 30, 2008. This total Company revenue amount of \$8,271,484 is
22		shown on ORS Audit Department witness Malini Gandhi's Attachment A to Audit
23		Exhibit MG-1 which also states the actual completed Construction Work In Progress per

- book amount as of June 30, 2008. Application of the retail jurisdictional factor of 94.33% to this total Company revenue requirement results in an additional retail revenue requirement of \$7,802,491.
- 4 Q. HOW DOES THIS COMPARE TO THE REQUEST IN THE COMPANY'S
 5 APPLICATION?
- The Company's requested revenue increase to the retail class is \$8,986,000.

 ORS's proposed additional retail revenue requirement of \$7,802,491 is \$1,183,509 or approximately 13.2% less than SCE&G's original request in this proceeding.
- 9 Q. DOES ORS HAVE A RECOMMENDATION FOR ALLOCATING THIS
 10 ADDITIONAL REVENUE REQUIREMENT?
 - A. Yes. The \$7,802,491 in additional revenue requirement should be allocated among the South Carolina retail classes based on each class's contribution to SCE&G's South Carolina firm peak demand in 2007. This is consistent with the method used by the Company in spreading the revenue requirement shown in the Application which erroneously included an amount that should have been allocated to the wholesale jurisdiction. The allocation for the four major retail class categories is shown on ORS Exhibit ARW-1. ORS recommends these four retail customer class revenues be used by SCE&G in determining the amount to be spread to each appropriate tariff/Rate Schedule. The revenues apportioned to each tariff/Rate Schedule should be in the same proportion as in the Company's Application.
- 21 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 22 A. Yes, it does.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

RATE DESIGN SUMMARY INCREASE ON MAY, 2008 RATES

				SCE&G					ORS RECOMMENDED	NDED
CLASS OF SERVICE		MAY, 2008 REVENUE		PROPOSED REVENUE	٥	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE		\$ CHANGE	CHANGE
						1		'		
RESIDENTIAL	⇔	828,150,951	69	832,473,171	6	4,322,220	0.52%	↔	\$ 3,752,998	0.45%
SMALL GENERAL SERVICE	↔	335,699,495	∽	337,313,895 \$	↔	1,614,400	0.48%	↔	1,402,888	0.42%
MEDIUM GENERAL SERVICE	↔	198,903,532	€	199,913,523 \$	∽	1,009,991	0.51%	↔	879,341	0.44%
LARGE GENERAL SERVICE	↔	465,063,123	6/3	467,097,711 \$ 2,034,588	↔	2,034,588	0.44%	↔	\$ 1,767,264	0.38%
TOTAL					⇔	8,981,199		69	7,802,491	